

DARREN T. BRENNER, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 8386  
NATALIE L. WINSLOW, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 12125  
AKERMAN LLP  
1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89134  
Telephone: (702) 634-5000  
Facsimile: (702) 380-8572  
Email: darren.brenner@akerman.com  
Email: natalie.winslow@akerman.com

*Attorneys for Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC  
and Federal Home Loan Mortgage  
Corporation*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BAYVIEW LOAN SERVICING, LLC and  
FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE  
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

RYAN P. WILLIAMS; HOLLY J. HARRISON;  
INDEPENDENCE HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION; TERRA WEST  
COLLECTIONS GROUP, LLC D/B/A  
ASSESSMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES;  
SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC; DOE  
INDIVIDUALS I-X, inclusive, and ROE  
CORPORATIONS I-X, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:17-cv-00452-GMN-CWH

**STIPULATION TO STAY ALL  
DISCOVERY AND DISPOSITIVE  
MOTION DEADLINE PENDING  
RESOLUTION OF PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS, ECF NO. 45**

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

1 Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (**Freddie Mac**),  
2 Independence Homeowners' Association (**HOA**), and SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC stipulate and agree  
3 to stay all remaining discovery and dispositive motion deadlines pending adjudication of Bayview and  
4 Freddie Mac's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 45.

5 **I. Procedural Background**

6 On February 10, 2017, Bayview and Freddie Mac filed its original complaint against defendants,  
7 seeking, *inter alia*, a declaratory judgment that the HOA's foreclosure sale did not extinguish the deed  
8 of trust. ECF No. 1. Freddie Mac, amongst others, also filed an amended complaint in case no. 2:15-  
9 cv-02381-GMN-VCF against SFR on June 6, 2016, alleging that the deed of trust was not extinguished  
10 as a result of the HOA foreclosure sale. On January 31, 2018, Bayview and Freddie Mac moved to  
11 dismiss the current litigation. ECF No. 45.

12 In the interests of judicial economy, the parties respectfully request all discovery and the  
13 dispositive motion deadline be stayed until the Court resolves the pending motion to dismiss. A ruling  
14 on the pending motion may obviate the need for further discovery in this case.

15 **II. Discovery Status**

16 Discovery closes in this matter on March 7, 2018, and dispositive motions are due by April 6,  
17 2018. ECF No. 32. Bayview and Freddie Mac have served initial and supplemental disclosures; the  
18 HOA has served initial disclosures; and SFR has served initial and supplemental disclosures. Bayview  
19 served interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for admission on the HOA and SFR on May  
20 10, 2017, and the HOA and SFR answered that written discovery.

21 SFR recently noticed the depositions of Bayview and Freddie Mac. The parties anticipate a  
22 dispute concerning the topics and location of the deposition, and anticipate that a motion for protective  
23 order may be filed if a stay is not entered. Bayview recently noticed the deposition of Assessment  
24 Management Services, the HOA, and SFR. SFR recently served interrogatories, requests for production,  
25 and requests for admission on Bayview and Freddie Mac, and the responses to the written discovery  
26 remain pending.

### III. The Case should be Stayed Pending Decision on the Motion to Dismiss

#### A. Tradebay Factors

"In evaluating the propriety of an order staying or limiting discovery while a dispositive motion is pending, the court considers the goal of Rule 1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which directs that the Rules shall 'be construed and administered to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action.'" *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 602 (D. Nev. 2011). This principle has guided the District of Nevada to develop a three-part test governing discovery stays. "First, the pending motion must be potentially dispositive of the entire case or at least the issue on which discovery is sought." *Rosenstein v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist.*, No. 2:13-CV-1443-JCM-VCF, 2014 WL 2835074, at \*3 (D. Nev. June 23, 2014) (citing *Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 600). "Second, the court must determine whether the pending motion to dismiss can be decided without additional discovery." *Id.* (citing *Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 600). Finally, "the court must take a 'preliminary peek' at the merits of the pending dispositive motion to assess whether a stay is warranted." *Id.* (quoting *Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 603).

First, Bayview and Freddie Mac's pending motion to dismiss is potentially dispositive of the entire case because if the motion is granted, this case is concluded. Second, Bayview and Freddie Mac's motion to dismiss can be decided without additional discovery. The only issue raised by the motion is whether this litigation should proceed in light of the litigation filed by Freddie Mac against SFR in case no. 2:15-cv-02381-GMN-VCF. No discovery will impact the outcome of the motion. Third, a "preliminary peek" at the motion shows that, on its merits, if granted it will fully resolve this matter.

#### B. Other Factors

Federal district courts have "wide discretion in controlling discovery." *Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681,685 (9th Cir. 1988). To determine if a stay is appropriate, the court considers (1) damage from the stay; (2) hardship or inequity that befalls one party more than the other; and (3) the orderly course of justice. *See Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007) (setting forth factors). Here, the factors support a stay of discovery pending resolution of the motion to dismiss.

First, any damage from a partial stay in this case will be minimal if balanced against the

potentially unnecessary fees, costs, and time which each party would have to incur in completing discovery, including travel and preparation for the above identified depositions and any related disputes. Moreover, the Court will be relieved of expending further time and effort considering any discovery-related motions or protective orders. Thus, a stay will benefit all parties involved as well as the Court. Lastly, judicial economy and the orderly course of justice support staying further discovery. Bayview and Freddie Mac's motion, if granted, will result in the resolution of the entire case. Without a stay of discovery, the parties will expend resources that will be unnecessary if the motion is granted. It is therefore appropriate for this court to exercise its power to grant a stay of discovery at this time. A trial date has not yet been set.

WHEREFORE, the parties respectfully request the Court issue an order staying discovery and future deadlines pending adjudication of Bayview and Freddie Mac's motion to dismiss.

DATED this 8th day of February, 2018.

**AKERMAN LLP**

/s/ Natlie L. Winslow

DARREN T. BRENNER, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 8386

NATALIE L. WINSLOW, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12125

1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200

Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Bayview Loan  
Servicing, LLC and Federal Home Loan  
Mortgage Corporation*

**KIM GILBERT EBRON**

/S/ DIANA S. EBRON

DIANA S. EBRON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 10580

JACQUELINE A. GILBERT, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 10593

KAREN L. HANKS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9578

7625 Dean Martin Drive, Suite 110

Las Vegas, Nevada 89139

*Attorneys for SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC*

**LEACH JOHNSON SONG & GRUCHOW**

/s/ Timothy C. Pittsenbarger

SEAN L. ANDERSON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 7259

TIMOTHY C. PITTSBARGER, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 13740

8945 West Russell Road, Suite 330

Las Vegas, Nevada 89148

*Attorneys for Independence Homeowners  
Association*

1 IT IS SO ORDERED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the motion to dismiss is  
2 denied, the parties must meet and confer and file a revised discovery plan within  
3 21 days of the court's order on the motion to dismiss.

4   
5 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

6 February 9, 2018

7 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28